



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,476	02/22/2002	Graeme John Proudler	B-4515 619561-7	8509

7590 08/08/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/080,476	PROUDLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanhnga B. Truong	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 11-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/2/07</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The applicant's amendment filed May 17, 2007 has been fully considered. Claims 11-19 are pending. At this time claims 11-19 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on July 02, 2007. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Election/Restrictions

3. Applicant's election with traverse of **Species 2** in the reply filed on May 17, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-10 are withdrawn by the applicant from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species 2 and species 3. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on December 11, 2006. This is not found persuasive because each of the various disclosed species details a mutual exclusive characteristic of:

Species 1 is drawn to "An information system comprising an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, together with security attributes of said computing platforms, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request."

Species 2 is drawn to "An information system comprising an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request."

These above individual species act as evidenced by the representation of each various species with a different figure or set of figures.

Art Unit: 2135

A search for one of these mutually exclusive characteristics is not coextensive with a search for the other mutually exclusive characteristics and therefore searching for all mutually exclusive characteristics could not be done without serious burden. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meadows et al (US 6,716,101 B1), and further in view of Chang et al (US 5,958,016).

a. Referring to claim 11:

i. Meadows teaches an information system comprising:

(1) an information access point relating to at least one pre-determined geographical area, said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area, said information system being arranged to provide said information to a user upon request (**column 2, lines 3-28 and column 5, lines 13-29 of Meadows**).

ii. Although Meadow teaches an information system using access point with related pre-determined geographical area for network communication via authorized user/client, Meadow is silent on the capability of communicating with trusted computing platform. On the other hand, Chang teaches this limitation in **column 14, lines 39-48 of Chang**.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

Art Unit: 2135

(1) have modified the invention of Meadow with the teaching of Chang for monitoring geographical location and movement (**column 1, line 11 of Meadow**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Meadow with the teaching of Chang for providing the location information to an authorized user through the world wide web (**column 2, lines 4-6 of Meadow**).

b. Referring to claim 12:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) wherein said information system is arranged to provide as said information only details and/or a list of public keys (e.g., access codes) of genuine trusted computing platforms within said pre-determined geographical area (**column 5, lines 13-29 of Meadows**).

c. Referring to claim 13:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Chang further teaches:

(1) wherein said information access point comprises a trusted computing platform (**column 14, lines 39-48 of Chang**).

d. Referring to claim 14:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadow further teaches:

(1) comprising apparatus for communicating or interacting with a user's portable computing apparatus (**column 5, lines 30-47 of Meadows**).

e. Referring to claim 15:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) wherein said apparatus for communicating or interacting a user's portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said

Art Unit: 2135

communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication (**column 5, lines 30-47 of Meadows**).

f. Referring to claims 16-17:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Meadows further teaches:

(1) incorporating or accompanied by a declaration concerning the trustworthiness of the system; wherein said declaration is capable of interpretation by a user without preprocessing by an information processing system [**i.e., Figures 4 and 5 shows the graphical user interface for monitoring system for monitoring the four adolescent children and the three individuals (column 5, lines 48-67 and column 6, lines 1-36 of Meadows)**].

g. Referring to claim 18:

i. The combination of teaching between Meadows and Chang teaches the claimed subject matter. Chang further teaches:

(1) arranged to verify the identity of a user (**column 21, lines 50-56 of Chang**).

h. Referring to claim 19:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 15, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Hind et al (US 6,772,331 B1) discloses a method and apparatus for exclusively pairing wireless devices (see Title).

b. Stewart et al (US 6,414,635 B1) discloses geographic-based communication service system with more precise determination of a user's known geographic location (see Title).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

Art Unit: 2135

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Thanhnguyen B. Tran

AU2135

TBT

July 31, 2007